

REMARKS

In response to the above Office Action, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

the common yarns constituting a woven structure binding said face side structure and said back side structure or a part thereof, and when each layer of said glass cloth is viewed from the surface thereof, the wefts of the face side structure and wefts of the back side structure do not overlap each other and the warps of the face side structure and the warps of the back side structure do not overlap each other.

Recitation of a gap and its dimensions has been deleted from the claim. As a result, claim 10 has been cancelled.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in Fig. 1 and on page 14 lines 22-28 and on page 16, line 21 to page 17, line 9 of the specification.

The double glass cloth of the present invention as set forth in amended claim 1, has a woven structure such that when each layer of said glass cloth is viewed from a surface thereof, the wefts of the face side structure and the wefts of the back side structure do not overlap each other and the warps of the face side structure and the warps of the back side structure do not overlap each other. Adopting such a woven structure considerably reduces the number of overlapping of crossover points of warps and wefts making it excellent in boring workability.

Especially when two extremely thin plain weave glass cloths are simply overlaid with each other, generally two types of areas are produced irregularly, i.e., one type of areas being such that the glass cloths overlay with each other in the vertical direction

and the other type of areas being such that the glass cloths overlay with each other by being alternately dislocated.

On the other hand, in the double glass cloth according to the present invention, neighboring yarns are basically divided into upper and lower parts, and therefore when viewed from the surface, yarns are uniformly arranged, providing excellent uniformity in the plane direction in the drilling and laser work or the like. (See page 14, lines 12-28 of the specification.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first and second paragraph, but deletion of the reference to "a gap" and its structure from claim 1 renders these rejections moot.

In addition, the Examiner continued to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious over De La Porte in view of Scari and further in view of Sanjana or/and Applicants' specification.

With respect to De La Porte, pile threads hold a face cloth and a back cloth together to make a double cloth. However, these pile threads do not constitute a woven structure binding the face side structure and the back side structure, or a part thereof as set forth in amended claim 1. When pile threads are used, another kind of warps must be provided as the pile threads and a particular weaving machine must be employed. This would decrease productivity for a double cloth.

Further, the double cloth of Fig. 1 of De La Porte has a structure such that at least weft threads 6 overlap one another when viewed from the surface of the cloth. In this case, the advantageous effect of the present invention cannot be obtained.

Accordingly, the claimed glass cloth is neither disclosed in the double cloth structure of De La Porte nor can it be considered to be an obvious modification of the

structure that is disclosed because it would not have the advantageous effect obtained by the cloth of the present invention.

With respect to the secondary references, since claim 1 no longer recites the thickness of the double glass cloth it is believed the Scari reference is no longer relevant. Similarly, since claim 1 no longer recites the gap or its dimensions it is believed the Sanjana reference is no longer relevant. In any event, these references do not disclose what is missing in the primary reference to De La Porte as discussed above, so they have not been discussed further in this Reply.

Regarding the rejections of claims 3, 4 and 11, De La Porte may show the features of claims 3 and 4 and the feature of claim 11 may be only a method step, but since these claims all depend from claim 1, it is believed they are not obvious over De La Porte for the same reasons noted above.

An RCE is being filed with this Reply to enable the Examiner to consider the amended claims at this time.

It is believed claims 1, 3, 4 and 11 are now in condition for allowance.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 22, 2010

By: 
Arthur S. Garrett
Reg. No. 20,338
(202) 408-4091